

## REMARKS

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "sheets" should be changed to "sheet". Appropriate correction has been made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cok, US 2004/0061439. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Cok teaches a method of manufacturing a flat panel light emitting device having predetermined dimensions, comprising: forming an area of light emitting materials of OLED on a substrate, the area having dimensions larger than the predetermined dimensions as shown in Figs. 5 and 6: and cutting a portion having the predetermined dimensions from the substrate to form the flat panel light emitting device with reference to Fig. 5 in paragraphs 24-31 and 35. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested with respect to amended claim 1.

Claim 1 as amended is directed towards a method of manufacturing a flat panel light emitting device having predetermined dimensions, comprising: a) forming an area of light emitting materials on a substrate, the area comprising an array of electrically connected light emitting elements and having dimensions larger than the predetermined dimensions; and b) cutting a portion of the array of electrically connected light emitting elements having the predetermined dimensions from the substrate to form the flat panel light emitting device. Support for the amendments may be found generally throughout the specification, and more particularly, e.g., at page 4, lines 3-6 (citing the feature of designing flat panel light emitting devices using a portion of a repeating pattern (i.e., array) of identical light emitting element cells cut from a larger array of such cells), and page 4 lines 17-20 (referencing electrical connectivity between the cells in the array of light emitting elements). As described at page 4, lines 6-9, such combination of features advantageously enables manufacture of different desired ratios of light emitting devices of various sizes to be achieved from a single larger array of light emitting elements with as little waste as possible.

Cok teaches an OLED lamp, and method of manufacture thereof, wherein the lamp comprises a substrate and a non-pixelated OLED formed on the substrate, wherein the OLED includes a first electrode extending from a first edge of the substrate toward a second opposite edge of the substrate, an OLED light emitting structure formed on top of the first electrode leaving exposed a portion of the first electrode near the first edge of the substrate, and a second electrode formed over the OLED light emitting structure and extending to the second edge of the substrate, and an encapsulating cover located over the non-pixelated OLED, leaving exposed portions of the first electrode and the second electrode for making electrical contact to the lamp. While Cok teaches that multiple individual lamps each comprising such a non-pixelated OLED may be cut from a continuous substrate, there is no teaching to form an array of electrically connected light emitting elements on a substrate and to cut a portion of the array of electrically connected light emitting elements to form a flat panel light emitting device having desired predetermined dimensions. While Fig. 5 of Cok does show multiple individual OLED lamps 56 formed on a continuous substrate, as described at paragraph [0025] such individual lamps are formed by interrupting the deposition of electrodes and light emitting materials. Thus, such individual light emitting elements are not electrically connected. In the alternative embodiment described in paragraph [0027], multiple OLED lamps are cut from a single continuously deposited OLED lamp structure. Again, this is not a disclosure of forming an array of electrically connected light emitting elements on a substrate and cutting a portion of the array of electrically connected light emitting elements to form a flat panel light emitting device having desired predetermined dimensions. Accordingly, Cok does not anticipate the present claimed invention.

It is noted that the Examiner references paragraph [0020] of Cok as teaching connecting light emitting elements in parallel. While Cok does disclose connecting multiple OLED layers in parallel in paragraph [0020], this is in reference to multiple OLED layers of an individual light emitting element structure, in the form of the multilayer embodiments of Fig. 3 and 4, and not to electrical connection between light emitting elements formed in an array on the substrate. Finally, the Examiner states that Cok teaches in paragraph [0003] that the light emitting area includes an array of light emitting elements and the flat-

panel light emitting device is a display. As noted above, however, Cok is specifically directed towards an OLED lamp comprising a substrate and a non-pixellated OLED formed thereon. Rather than teach or suggest application of the specific OLED structure of Cok to display devices comprising an array of light emitting elements, paragraph [0003] instead suggests that the use of multiple individual light sources on a substrate for light source applications increases the complexity and manufacturing costs of such devices, thus if anything teaching away from the use of an array of light emitting elements.

As Cok clearly does not anticipate the present claimed invention, reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully urged.

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok, US 2004/0061439 in view of Daniels, US 2005/0025881. Claims 5, 9, 10 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok, US 2004/0061439 in view of Grace, US 2002/0196401. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok, US 2004/0061439 in view of Grace, US 2002/0196401 and Hermens, US 5,706,069. While a prima facie case of obviousness is not believed to have been established as the display device teachings of the additional cited art is not believed to be properly combinable with the non-pixellated OLED lamp devices of Cok, reconsideration of these rejections is additionally respectfully urged in view of the following statement of common ownership of the inventions:


#### **STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP**

The subject matter of US 2004/0061439 and the present claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to Eastman Kodak Company.

As this application was filed on or after November 29, 1999, an obviousness rejection over Cok under 102(e)/103 is not appropriate in view of the above statement of common ownership.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (585) 722-9662  
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.